



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
01/17/2002	Takuya Kobayashi	2002_0037A	5356	
7590 02/17/2006		EXAMINER		
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.			CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA	
ET N. W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021		.		
	01/17/2002 590 02/17/2006 CH, LIND & PONACK ET N. W.	01/17/2002 Takuya Kobayashi 590 02/17/2006 'H, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. ET N. W.	01/17/2002 Takuya Kobayashi 2002_0037A 590 02/17/2006 EXAM CH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. CERVETTI, DA ET N. W. ART UNIT	

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)	
10/046,819	KOBAYASHI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
David G. Cervetti	2136		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

The MALLING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 31 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
I. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>46-58.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10. [_] Other

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made.

Furthermore, they raise new arguments that would require further searching and consideration.

Woolsey and Gong clearly teach the receiver and unprotected data authetnication unit (Woolsey, columns 19-21, Gong, pages 3-8).

Kolouch clearly teaches the combination of the unprotected list generation unit, the data generation unit, and the unprotected data authentication unit (columns 3-6).

Furthermore, Cofta (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0016042), cited on the previous office action, discloses loading program modules in a terminal using digital signatures and encryption.

Shear (US Patent 6,157,721) discloses a verifying authority digitally signs a load module or other executable with several different digital signatures and/or signature schemes, a protected processing environment or other secure execution space may require a load module or other executable to present multiple digital signatures before accepting it. An attacker would have to "break" each (all) of the several digital signatures and/or signature schemes to create an unauthorized load module or other executable that would be accepted by the protected processing environment or other secure execution space. Different protected processing environments (secure execution spaces) might examine different subsets of the multiple digital signatures—so that compromising one protected processing environment (secure execution space) will not compromise all of them. As an optimization, a protected processing environment or other secure execution space might verify only one of the several digital signatures (for example, chosen at random each time an executable is used)—thereby speeding up the digital signature verification while still maintaining a high degree of security (column 6, lines 1-67, column 7, lines 1-67).

Atkinson (US Patent Number 5,892,904) discloses a certification or signing method that ensures the authenticity and integrity of a computer program.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
FECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100